



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,889	06/28/2006	Ling Zheng	T3653-8972US01	1905
181	7590	10/02/2008	EXAMINER	
MILES & STOCKBRIDGE PC			JAMAL, ALEXANDER	
1751 PINNACLE DRIVE				
SUITE 500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MCLEAN, VA 22102-3833			2614	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/02/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ipdocketing@milesstockbridge.com
sstiles@milesstockbridge.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/596,889	ZHENG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ALEXANDER JAMAL	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 June 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. **Claim 5** objected to because of the following informalities: ‘applicable’ should be changed to ‘applicable to’. Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

1. Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled “Replacement Sheet” in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1- rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cioffi et al (US 20080071516 A1), and further in view of Shi et al (US 20040101130 A1).

As per **claim 1**, Cioffi discloses a DSL loop qualification system comprising an estimator that estimates a loop characteristic (such as length) and uses it to compare to known loop types in order to gauge an estimated data rate (para. 17,56). A possible data rate must be estimated before it can be used to set the user's settings. The data rate is

based on a comparison to known loop types, which have associated estimated data rates.

Theoretical results are determined (the models disclosed in para. 22). However, Cioffi does not disclose an optimized TDR means to determine the disclosed estimated loop length.

Shi discloses a known TDR algorithm to determine DSL loop length (para. 24). The algorithm and as such, the TDR length is optimized (high precision: abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this application to implement a known and high precision means of determining loop length for the purpose of producing the disclosed estimates in Cioffi.

As per **claim 2,4,8,10,12,13,14,16,18**, the device inherently detects a time shift between a theoretical echo and a received echo because the system correlates the received echo delay to a loop length (Shi para. 24). The correlation between the loop length and echo delay must derive from a theoretical delay measurement in a known system (in order to know exactly how they would correlate). As such the system detects the difference or ‘time shift’ (via the correlation) between the measured and theoretical echo delays.

As per **claims 6,7,9,15,17,19**, it is rejected as per the claim 1,2 rejections.

As per **claim 3**, it is rejected as per the claim 1 rejection.

As per **claims 5,11**, the echoes are caused by impedance mismatches, which would cover all the claimed type of loops.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Jamal whose telephone number is 571-272-7498. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9AM-6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis A Kuntz can be reached on 571-272-7499. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are **571-273-8300** for regular communications and **571-273-8300** for After Final communications.

/Alexander Jamal/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614

Examiner Alexander Jamal

October 2, 2008